



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/658,139	09/09/2003	Ed H. Frank	14182US02	3006
23446 7590 05/19/2008 MCANDREWS HELD & MALLOY, LTD 500 WEST MADISON STREET SUITE 3400 CHICAGO, IL 60661			EXAMINER HOANG, HIEU T	
			ART UNIT 2152	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 05/19/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but found unpersuasive.

35 U.S.C. 101

Claims 11-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Since no explicit definition of a computer-readable medium can be found in the specification, given its broadest reasonable interpretation, a computer-readable medium having stored thereon, a computer program, can be read by one skilled in the art as any of a transmission media (cable, wire, wireless media), signals or signal-carrying waves and is therefore non-statutory for not falling in any one of the four categories: a process, machine, manufacture or composition of matter.

35 U.S.C 102 and 103

Applicants argue that SA (security associations) of Laurila has nothing to do with authenticating the device at each access point AP. The examiner respectfully traverses. Laurila discloses that SA is transferred between various APs to avoid the need for a new authentication key that is used to authenticate both ends of the communications pair that is made up of a mobile terminal and an AP (col. 5 lines 43-50). Furthermore, authentication information related to said initial authentication is just any information that can be related to the authentication of a device, and not necessarily be authentication parameters involved in the authentication process. So authentication information can be read as an SA.

Applicant argues that the prior art does not teach "servicing said access device by one of said first access point, said second access point and said third access point based on said initial authentication." This limitation can be read as "servicing said access device by one of said first access point based on said initial authentication." Servicing the device by the the first access point based on said initial authentication is inherently disclosed by Laurila (fig. 2, old AP servicing mobile terminal using initial authentication). Furthermore, the fact that Laurila discloses that SA to be transferred in advance of resuming service at a second AP can read on "servicing the device by the the second access point based on said initial authentication" (see fig. 3, SA is transferred before resuming service)

Further arguments will be provided as deemed needed.

HH

05/15/2008